



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/897,653	06/29/2001	Alan Chris Berkema	10016783-1	9773
7590	01/07/2005		EXAMINER	
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY Intellectual Property Administration P.O. Box 272400 Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400			WALLERSON, MARK E	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2626	
DATE MAILED: 01/07/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/897,653	BERKEMA ET AL
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Mark E. Wallerson	2626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

**A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM
 THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.**

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 September 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 2-4, 6, 15, 17, 18, 21-25, 30, 32 and 33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 2-4, 6, 15, 17, 18, 21-25, 30, 32 and 33 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2626

Part III DETAILED ACTION

Notice to Applicant(s)

1. This action is responsive to the following communications: amendment filed on 9/2/04.
2. This application has been reconsidered. Claims 2-4, 6, 15, 17, 18, 21-25, 30, and 32-33 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 3, 15, 17, 18, 21, 22, 23, 24, 30, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lamming et al (Lamming) (U.S. 5,862,321).

With respect to claims 3, 21, 22, 23, 24, 30, Lamming discloses a print by reference method executable by a portable wireless device (16) comprising obtaining a reference to print content stored at a location indicated by the reference (column 9, line 10 to column 10, line 4), and wirelessly communicating the reference to another device to initiate a print by reference of the print content (column 9, line 10 to column 10, line 4), wherein the reference specifies print format information (confidential print) (column 9, lines 10-27).

With respect to claims 15, 17, 18, Lamming discloses a print by reference method executable by a portable wireless device (16) comprising obtaining a reference to print content stored at a location indicated by the reference (column 9, line 10 to column 10, line 4), and

Art Unit: 2626

wirelessly communicating the reference to another device to initiate a print by reference of the print content (column 9, line 10 to column 10, line 4), and requesting information of the capability of another device (column 6, lines 42-52 and column 19, lines 15-27).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 2, 6, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lamming (U.S. 5,862,321) in view of Wolf (U.S. 5,848,413).

With respect to claim 2, Lamming discloses a print by reference method executable by a portable wireless device (16) comprising obtaining a reference to print content stored at a location indicated by the reference (column 9, line 10 to column 10, line 4), and wirelessly communicating the reference to another device to initiate a print by reference of the print content (column 9, line 10 to column 10, line 4).

Lamming differs from claim 2 in that he does not clearly disclose the reference specifies billing information. Wolff discloses a method for accessing and publishing electronic documents wherein the information includes billing (charging) information (column 10, lines 31-36). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Lamming wherein the reference specifies billing information. It

Art Unit: 2626

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Lamming by the teaching of Wolff in order to allow the print provider to charge for services.

With respect to claim 6, Lamming discloses a print by reference method executable by a portable wireless device (16) comprising obtaining a reference to print content stored at a location indicated by the reference (column 9, line 10 to column 10, line 4), and wirelessly communicating the reference to another device to initiate a print by reference of the print content (column 9, line 10 to column 10, line 4).

Lamming differs from claim 6 in that he does not clearly disclose specifying a number of copies to be printed. Wolf discloses specifying a number of copies to be printed (column 6, lines 58-62). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Lamming wherein the number of copies to be printed is specified. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Lamming by the teaching of Wolf in order to improve the efficiency of the print system.

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lamming (Lamming '321) in view of Lamming (U.S. 5,539,665) (Lamming '665).

Art Unit: 2626

With respect to claim 4, Lamming '321 discloses a print by reference method executable by a portable wireless device (16) comprising obtaining a reference to print content stored at a location indicated by the reference (column 9, line 10 to column 10, line 4), and wirelessly communicating the reference to another device to initiate a print by reference of the print content (column 9, line 10 to column 10, line 4).

Lamming '321 differs from claim 4 in that he does not clearly disclose the reference specifies time and date information.

Lamming '665 discloses a method or recording and retrieving information wherein the time-stamped and stored chronologically (the abstract and column 2, lines 52-56). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Lamming '321 wherein time and data information is specified. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Lamming '321 by the teaching of Lamming '665 in order to more clearly specify the images to be retrieved.

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 32 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lamming in view of Nachtsheim et al (U.S. 6,448,906).

With respect to claims 32 and 33, Lamming discloses a print by reference method executable by a portable wireless device (16) comprising obtaining a reference to print content stored at a location indicated by the reference (column 9, line 10 to column 10, line 4), and wirelessly communicating the reference to another device to initiate a print by reference of the print content (column 9, line 10 to column 10, line 4).

Lamming differs from claims 32 and 33 in that he does not clearly disclose communicating the reference in Bluetooth format. Nachtsheim discloses a wireless communication method wherein bluetooth methods are used for communication. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Lamming wherein the reference is communicated in Bluetooth format. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Lamming by the teaching of Nachtsheim in order to improve the communication process.

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 2-4, 6, 15, 17, 18, 21-25, 30, and 32-33 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark E. Wallerson whose telephone number is (703) 305-8581. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday - 6:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kimberly Williams can be reached on (703) 305-4863. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mark E. Wallerson
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2626

MARK WALLERSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER

